

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

BOXABL INC.,
Plaintiff(s),

Case No. 2:23-cv-01213-RFB-NJK

v.

ORDER

[Docket No. 69]

JONATHAN GARMAN,
Defendant(s).

Pending before the Court is a stipulated protective order that includes, in the undersigned's experience, several novel and problematic provisions. Docket No. 69. Entry of a stipulated protective order should be a routine matter that does not warrant expenditure of significant judicial resources, so the Court declines at this juncture to get into the weeds on each of those issues with respect to the pending stipulated protective order. Instead, counsel must engage in further conferral efforts upon consulting with the model protective order used by United States Magistrate Judge Jacqueline Chooljian in the Central District of California.¹ While references therein to specific local rules would need to be adjusted to reflect the local rules in this District, the structure and provisions therein otherwise would seem to be an appropriate starting point (and perhaps ending point) for the effort to designate documents as confidential in this case.

Accordingly, the stipulated protective order is **DENIED** without prejudice. The parties must confer and file an amended stipulated protective order. The amended stipulated protective order must also include as an exhibit a redline showing any departures from Judge Chooljian's

¹ Judge Chooljian's model for an attorneys' eyes only protective order is listed as "JC Atty Eyes Only Form Protective Order" at <https://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/honorable-jacqueline-chooljian>.

1 model protective order, along with a brief explanation as to why each such departure is warranted
2 by the circumstances of this case.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: June 7, 2024

5
6 
Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28